United Nations A/C.2/68/SR.41

General Assembly
Sixty-eighth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
17 January 2014

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 41st meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 11 December 2013, at 4 p.m.

Chair: Mr. Diallo ..... (Senegal)

Contents

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*)

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference (*continued*)

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*)

(c) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (*continued*)

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*)

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(d) Culture and development (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent as soon as possible, under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, to the Chief of the Documents Control Unit (srcorrections@un.org), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrected records will be reissued electronically on the Official Document System of the United Nations (http://documents.un.org/).

13-61537 (E)

Please recycle

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(c) Human resources development (*continued*)

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation (*continued*)

Agenda item 122: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Agenda item 135: Programme planning

Conclusion of the work of the Second Committee

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Agenda item 16: Information and communications technologies for development (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.18)

Draft resolution on International Day for the Promotion and Protection of Telework (A/C.2/68/L.18)

1. **The Chair** said that, in view of the note verbale that both the Permanent Mission of Senegal and the Secretariat had received from the Permanent Mission of Fiji, requesting that the matter should be kept open under agenda item 16 to allow informal consultation on the draft resolution to continue in 2014, the Committee would not take action on the draft resolution. To that end, the Office of the President of the General Assembly would be advised to keep agenda item 16 open.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.18 was withdrawn.*

Draft resolution on Information and communications technologies for development (A/C.2/68/L.73 and A/C.2/68/L.40)

3. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.73, submitted by Mr. Dhanapala (Sri Lanka), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.40. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

4. *It was so decided.*

5. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.73 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that according to paragraph 21 of the text, the General Assembly would decide to finalise the modalities for the General Assembly's overall WSIS+10 review, in accordance with paragraph 111 of the Tunis Agenda, no later than end of March 2014. In the absence of modalities, it was not currently possible to estimate the potential costs implications of the requirements for meetings and documentation. Upon decision on the modalities by the General Assembly, the Secretary-General would submit the relevant costs in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure. Adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.73 would thus not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

6. **Ms. Francis** (Bahamas), in her capacity as facilitator of the informal consultations, proposed an amendment to the draft resolution. Preambular paragraph 36 should be amended to read: "*Taking note* of the successful meetings of the Internet Governance Forum held to date, and welcoming the offers to host the next three meetings of the Forum from Turkey in 2014, Brazil in 2015 and Mexico in 2016, in the event of a renewal of the mandate of the Forum,".

7. **Mr.** Iqbal **Khan** (Pakistan) said that the role of information and communications technologies (ICTs) were continuing to grow in both the economic and social arenas, as was the need to build an effective Internet governance system that took into account the diverse needs and challenges faced by people and countries. ICTs acted as levelling agents and helped to empower people and promote development.

8. His delegation believed that significant emphasis should be placed on improving Internet governance, while respecting national sovereignty, human rights and fundamental freedoms. It could not be denied that certain segments of the population were using ICTs to commit cybercrimes, acts of terrorism, or to incite religious hatred and intolerance. As the review summit in 2015 neared, it was clearer than ever that appropriate international norms were needed for Internet governance. The task of addressing it was complex and far-reaching, and a holistic approach must consider its day-to-day impact on socioeconomic development, individual freedoms and national sovereignty. In that regard, his delegation requested the Secretary-General to devote a chapter in his report to the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly to the emerging challenge of Internet governance.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.73, as orally revised, was adopted.*

10. **Mr. Momita** (Japan) said that Japan was committed to addressing the digital divide by contributing to economic development in all Member States. It was also committed to the General Assembly's overall review of World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) outcomes in 2015, in accordance with paragraph 111 of the Tunis Agenda. It respected the need for consensus among Member States to finalize modalities.

11. However, an additional summit was not necessary. The outcomes of the WSIS conference were still applicable and there was no need to modify them. The Tunis Agenda stipulated that the review must be handled by the General Assembly; thus a new summit would be contradictory to the original intentions. Furthermore, no Member State had yet offered to host a summit in 2014.

12. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation had been pleased to join consensus on the draft resolution, which promoted ICTs as a force for economic growth. It appreciated the steps taken within and outside the United Nations system to follow up the commitments made at the World Summit on the Information Society and looked forward to working with the co-facilitators to finalize the modalities for the overall review by the General Assembly of the implementation of the World Summit on the Information Society, in accordance with paragraph 111 of the Tunis Agenda. Those modalities should incorporate a series of independent evaluations carried out by the relevant United Nations agencies, as agreed by the General Assembly and Economic and Social Council. The Commission on Science and Technology for Development should review the progress made towards achieving the goals set at the Summit, including implementation of the 11 action lines, and report to the General Assembly, which would consider the following steps in the autumn of 2015. The main focus of attention and resources should be the implementation of the World Summit action lines. A new summit was not necessary, and the decision whether or not to hold such a summit should not distract the stakeholders from their responsibilities or prejudge the outcome of the review.

13. It was important to promote the multi-stakeholder character of the review and support such multi-stakeholder initiatives as the Internet Governance Forum, which were fostering affordable Internet access for people around the world. Her delegation therefore welcomed the offers of Turkey, Brazil, and Mexico to host meetings of the Forum in 2014, 2015, and 2016 respectively, and looked forward to extending the mandate of the Forum at the next opportunity.

14. Although the Human Rights Council and Third Committee were more appropriate venues for the discussion of human rights issues, her country agreed wholeheartedly that States must respect online the same rights that existed offline, including the rights to privacy and freedom of expression as set forth in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The United States remained committed to working with all Member States, through the Human Rights Council and Third Committee, to promote freedom of expression and privacy online so that people all over the world could use the Internet and online resources to exercise their rights freely.

15. **Mr. Devanlay** (Observer for the European Union) said that the European Union was strongly committed to using ICTs in the process of development. The fundamental aim of WSIS was the crucial goal of improving people's lives. ICTs had a growing role not only as tools of communication, but also as enablers of development. He agreed that there was no need for an additional summit.

16. **Mr. Nisan** (Canada) said that his delegation supported the heart of the resolution, the importance of ensuring that all people could harness the benefits of ICTs to meet development goals. Focus should remain on ensuring that ICTs continued to drive economic growth and development for the benefit of all.

17. However, his delegation had several concerns regarding the human rights provisions contained in the resolution. Canada believed that human rights issues should not have been dealt with in the resolution, as they were more appropriately addressed by the Third Committee. As human rights provisions were included, however, Canada felt that they should have been more strongly worded, in conformity with his delegation's explanation of position on the Third Committee resolution on the Right to Privacy in the Digital Age. The same rights that people had offline must also be protected online, in particular freedom of expression.

18. The review process must continue to respect paragraph 111 of the Tunis Agenda and focus exclusively on the overall review of the implementation of WSIS outcomes.

19. **Ms. Levavi** (Israel) said that her delegation recognized the critical role of ICTs in development. The past decade had shown the importance of using a multi-stakeholder approach to address the issues related to global internet governance. In finalizing the modalities of the General Assembly's overall review, it was crucial to maintain and respect its multi-stakeholder character. Her delegation concurred that a WSIS+10 summit was not necessary to conclude the overall review already in motion.

20. **Ms. Patmore** (Australia) agreed that the same rights enjoyed offline must also be protected online, in particular freedom of expression and the right to privacy. Her delegation noted the references to privacy contained in the resolution and reaffirmed its strong support for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, believing that such references were consistent with Australia's long-held positions.

21. Australia recognized that the General Assembly had been mandated to conduct an overall review of WSIS+10 outcomes in 2015, but did not believe that a follow-up summit was either mandated or necessary for the effective conclusion of the review process.

22. **Mr. Al Otaibi** (Saudi Arabia) said that, while his delegation had joined the consensus on the resolution, it believed that the first ten-year review event of the World Summit on the Information Society, organized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, ought rather to have been held in the manner agreed at the second phase of the Summit in Tunis. In view of the importance of ICT, the overall review of the Summit outcomes should be held at the summit level or at the highest level possible, as had been stated at the second phase of the Summit.

23. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.40 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 17: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(c) External debt sustainability and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.70 and A/C.2/68/L.15)

Draft resolution on External debt sustainability and development (A/C.2/68/L.70 and A/C.2/68/L.15)

24. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.70, submitted by Ms. Brown (Jamaica), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.15.

25. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.70 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that in paragraph 27 of the resolution, the General Assembly would decide to convene at its sixty-ninth session a special joint meeting of the Second Committee and the Economic and Social Council to consider lessons learned from debt crises and the ongoing work on sovereign debt restructuring and debt resolution mechanisms. As the two entities were allowed to hold meetings on an "as required" basis, the special joint meeting would use the meetings entitlement of the Second Committee or the Economic and Social Council, thus avoiding any meetings implications.

26. The request for documentation contained in paragraph 27 would constitute an addition to the workload of the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management of one document of 8,500 words to be issued in all six languages with a total cost of $50,900. While no provision for the requested activity had yet been made under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015, all possible efforts would be made to absorb the additional cost from within the existing resources under Section 2 of the proposed programme budget for the aforementioned biennium.

27. **Mr. Landveld** (Suriname), speaking in his capacity as facilitator of the informal consultations, proposed a correction to paragraph 30 of the Spanish version of the draft resolution.

28. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.70, as orally revised, was adopted.*

29. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.15 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 18: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the 2002 International Conference on Financing for Development and the 2008 Review Conference (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.75 and A/C.2/68/L.25)

Draft resolution on Follow-up to the International Conference on Financing for Development (A/C.2/68/L.75 and A/C.2/68/L.25)

30. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.75, submitted by Ms. Brown (Jamaica), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.25. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

31. *It was so decided.*

32. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.75 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that in paragraphs 29 and 30 of the resolution, the General Assembly had

decided to convene in 2015 or 2016 a third international conference on financing for development. Consequently, it requested the President of the General Assembly to convene, as soon as a possible, inclusive and transparent intergovernmental consultations on all issues related to the conference, including the date, format, organization and scope.

33. It was understood that the President of the General Assembly would consider all issues related to the conference. Accordingly, in the absence of modalities for the conference, it was not currently possible to estimate the potential costs implications of the requirements for meetings and documentation. Upon the decision on the modalities, format and organization of the conference, the Secretary-General would submit the relevant costs in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure.

34. The intergovernmental consultations would be included in the programme of work of the resumed part of the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly from January to August 2014 with the understanding that they would not meet in parallel with the plenary or other meetings of the General Assembly. As such, those meetings would not constitute additions to the meetings workload of the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management. Consequently adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.75 would not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

35. **Ms. Luna** (Mexico) said that minor comments on the Spanish text of the draft resolution would be communicated directly to the Secretariat.

36. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.75 was adopted.*

37. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.25 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 19: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.33 and A/C.2/68/L.62)

Draft resolution on Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (A/C.2/68/L.33 and A/C.2/68/L.62)

38. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.62, submitted by Ms. Hay (New Zealand), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.33.

39. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.62 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that in paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly had decided to hold a series of four one-day structured dialogues to consider possible arrangements for a facilitation mechanism to promote the development, transfer and dissemination of clean and environmentally sound technologies. It had also decided that the dialogues would result in a summary of discussions and recommendations, including on possible modalities and organization of such a mechanism, to be submitted by the President of the General Assembly to the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly, for consideration and appropriate action at its sixty-ninth session.

40. Pursuant to the aforementioned request, each of the four one-day dialogues would be comprised of two meetings with interpretation in all six languages, for a total of 8 meetings. However, the interpretation services for the meetings would be provided on an "if available" basis. Accordingly, the dates of the meetings would have to be determined in consultation with the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management and would not constitute additions to the meetings workload of the Department.

41. Adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.62 would thus not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015.

42. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.62 was adopted.*

43. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that there was a need to promote synergy, coherence and mutual support for the post-2015 development agenda, and for further mainstreaming of the three dimensions of sustainable development throughout the United Nations system. Although it had joined consensus for those reasons, her delegation had three main concerns with the draft resolution. First, the term "right to development" had been used without an agreed definition. Any discussion of rights relating to development should focus on universal rights that were held and enjoyed by individuals, and which all individual could demand from their own Government. Second, the references to facilitation of technology transfer and diffusion did not sufficiently emphasize the need for recipient countries to create an enabling environment, including protection for intellectual property rights, in order to absorb transferred technologies. Third, in implementing the resolution, all appropriate existing provisions and mandates within and beyond the United Nations system should be taken into consideration in order to avoid duplication. The draft resolution provided helpful guidance towards that objective, and her delegation would circulate separately a non-exhaustive list of existing mechanisms. Examples included the World Intellectual Property Organization, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, other green knowledge-sharing platforms, the Eco-Patent Commons and many national programmes, some of which fast-tracked green patent applications.

44. **Mr.** Mohamed **Khalil** (Egypt) said that it was of some concern that after concluding negotiations in good faith and transparency, the draft resolution was subsequently being reinterpreted. His delegation did not feel that reinterpreting the agreement would be helpful or support the consensus.

45. Science and technology were pivotal for innovation and knowledge-sharing to support the eradication of poverty and sustainable development. ICTs were often game-changing for developing countries, and a prerequisite for social and economic transformation. Developing countries must rely heavily on technology to shift towards sustainability. In order to help them, it was imperative to bridge the digital divide and promote inclusive growth.

46. Despite recent progress in access to technology, the divides between countries and regions remained persistent. For example, about 70 per cent of research and development still took place in developed countries, in part because developing countries faced obstacles affecting access to finance, capacity-building and market formation.

47. His delegation stressed the need for a transformative change in the post-2015 development agenda. It could not happen without a breakthrough in information transfer on the global level.

48. **Mr. Narang** (India) said that his delegation saw technology and technology cooperation as an integral component and concrete deliverable of the sustainable development goals, as well as the post-2015 development agenda. A technology facilitation mechanism had clearly been mandated in the outcomes of Rio+20 but no such mechanism was operational yet.

49. In the intervening period, extensive consultations had been conducted and two reports of the Secretary-General had recommended the establishment of a technology facilitation mechanism under the United Nations. So far representatives had been discussing technology cooperation matters, but it was time to go beyond words and work towards concrete action. His delegation hoped that the resolution would allow for the creation of such a mechanism.

49. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.33 was withdrawn.*

(b) Follow-up to and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.67 and A/C.2/68/L.41)

Draft resolution on Follow-up and implementation of the Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (A/C.2/68/L.67 and A/C.2/68/L.41)

50. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.67, submitted by Ms. Hay (New Zealand), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft

resolution A/C.2/68/L.41. He drew the Committee's attention to the statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/C.2/68/L.54.

51. **Mr. Zvachula** (Federated States of Micronesia) proposed a revision to the text of the resolution. In preambular paragraph 4, the words "Independent State of Samoa" should be added directly after "Apia".

52. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.67, as orally revised, was adopted.*

53. **Mr. Tuiloma** (Fiji), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that that his delegation was dismayed by the amount of time taken by discussions of programme budget implications during the negotiations. The process would have been globally more efficient and effective if programme budget implications had not monopolized the conversation.

54. **Ms. Robl** (United States of America) said that her delegation was pleased to join consensus and looked forward to a successful third International Conference on Small Island Developing States. It had, however, been surprised and disappointed to learn that appropriate funding for the Conference and preparatory process had not been set aside once the dates were known. It had expected that all relevant entities would have included funds related to the Conference as part of their initial overall request for the 2014-2015 biennium. Her delegation understood that the necessary funds would be found within the budget of the 2014-2015 biennium. It would work closely with its partners in the Fifth Committee to secure such funding, and firmly expected that the Secretariat would make all necessary efforts to eliminate the need for any increases to the regular budget.

55. **Mr. Devanlay** (Observer for the European Union), speaking on behalf of the European Union and its member States, said that the European Union and its member States were major partners of small island developing States and remained committed to the Barbados Programme of Action and the Mauritius Strategy of Implementation. Emphasis was being placed on partnerships at different levels that went beyond pure donor-recipient relationships, and which were anchored on national ownership, mutual trust, equity, respect and mutual accountability, while engaging the private sector, civil society and other relevant stakeholders. The European Union and small island States were natural, equal partners on critical global issues, which by definition defied borders and on many of which the two already agreed.

56. However, although its commitment to small island developing States and the upcoming conference was clear and unequivocal, the European Union was dismayed and deeply disappointed at the programme budget implications of the draft resolution, and at the opaque and misleading process that had produced them. Although Member States had been given oral guarantees from the Secretariat that no programme budget implications would be associated with the draft resolution, only a few days before the end of negotiations the Secretariat had delivered the surprising and contradictory news that both the conference services for the preparatory committee meetings and the conference itself would entail budget implications. Seriously concerned with the situation, the European Union had requested clarification before joining consensus, and had received positive signals that all efforts would be made to absorb the budget implications. However, it was frustrating that the revised statement of programme budget implications had only been factually updated to match the final number of preparatory committee days as decided by Member States, and did not predict any absorption.

57. As the decision of holding the conference and creating a preparatory committee was not a last-minute surprise for Member States or the Secretariat, the European Union failed to understand why no provisions for conference services had been made in the initial proposed budget of the Secretary-General for the 2014-2015 biennium, nor did it understand why the requirements were not elaborated in a revised budget proposal.

58. The sustainable development of small island developing States and the success of the Samoa Conference should not and would not suffer from, nor be taken hostage by, questionable budget process decisions made within the Secretariat. The European Union and its member States was committed to ensuring that the Fifth Committee discussions would lead to the conference services requirements being met from within the 2014-2015 budget allocation. The European Union did not consider the programme budget implications statement contained in A/C.2/68/L.54 as having been endorsed in any way.

59. **Mr. Mikami** (Japan), speaking in explanation of position, said that despite being one of the strongest

supporters of small island developing States, Japan was deeply disappointed and concerned with the budgetary issues associated with the draft resolution. It was regrettable that the programme budget implications had been generated in a completely unexpected way, due to insufficient information provided to Member States and a lack of communication within the Secretariat.

60. It was quite surprising that the Secretariat had not set aside the necessary funds in its initial biennium budget request and was consequently holding the preparatory process and the conference itself hostage. Japan still believed that the programme budget implications could have been avoided if the relevant officers had communicated and provided information in a timely manner. Japan also hoped that such a situation would not happen again, and consequently recognized the need to improve working methods for budget processes which continued to cause confusion. It was hoped that the result of upcoming Fifth Committee discussions would entail the absorption of all programme budget implications into the regular budget.

61. **Mr. Elisaia** (Samoa), referring to the editorial change made to the draft resolution, said that he hoped that his country's name would not be cut out again, as mentioning Apia without a full reference to the Independent State of Samoa would cause confusion.

62. The draft resolution was important to all small island developing States and Samoa in particular as preparations for the conference were being finalized. Success would rely on a joint effort that included the Secretariat.

63. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.41 was withdrawn.*

(c) International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.66 and A/C.2/68/L.39)

Draft resolution on International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (A/C.2/68/L.66 and A/C.2/68/L.39)

64. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.66, submitted by Ms. Hay (New Zealand), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.39. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

65. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.66 was adopted.*

66. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.39 was withdrawn.*

(f) Convention on Biological Diversity (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.72 and A/C.2/68/L.42)

Draft resolution on Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its contribution to sustainable development (A/C.2/68/L.72 and A/C.2/68/L.42)

67. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.72, submitted by Ms. Hay (New Zealand), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.42. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

68. **Mr. Landveld** (Suriname), speaking in his capacity as facilitator of the informal consultations, said that in paragraph 14, the words "on biological diversity" should be inserted after the words "invites the secretariat of the Convention".

69. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.72, as orally revised, was adopted.*

70. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.42 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 21: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(d) Culture and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.69 and A/C.2/68/L.34)

Draft resolution on Culture and sustainable development (A/C.2/68/L.69 and A/C.2/68/L.34)

71. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.69, submitted by Mr. Dhanapala (Sri Lanka), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.34. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure.

72. *It was so decided.*

73. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Committee), reading out a statement in connection with draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.69 in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure, said that pursuant to the request for a one-day special thematic debate contained in paragraph 20, it was envisioned that the debate would be split into a morning and an afternoon session, with interpretation in all six languages, to be held between January and August of 2014. The two meetings would take the meetings entitlement of the

General Assembly on the understanding that it would not meet in parallel with other General Assembly meetings. Therefore, the meetings would not constitute additions to the workload of the Department of General Assembly and Conference Management.

74. Adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.69 would thus not give rise to any financial implications under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014-2015. With regard to the request to hold the debate within existing resources, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the provisions of section IV of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990 and subsequent resolutions including the most recent resolution 66/246 of 24 December 2011, in which the General Assembly had reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee entrusted with the responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters.

75. **Mr. Iziraren** (Morocco), speaking in his capacity as facilitator of the informal consultations, proposed two revisions to the draft resolution. In paragraph 21, lines 3 and 4, the words "exclusively in order to register the report in a procedural manner" should be deleted. In the same paragraph, line 7, the words "bearing in mind the need" should also be deleted. The changes should be reflected in all translations of the draft resolution.

76. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.69, as orally revised, was adopted.*

77. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.34 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 23: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(c) Human resources development (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.68 and A/C.2/68/L.6)

Draft resolution on Human resources development (A/C.2/68/L.68 and A/C.2/68/L.6)

78. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.68, submitted by Ms. Rebedea (Romania), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.6. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

79. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.68 was adopted.*

80. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.6 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 24: Operational activities for development (*continued*)

(b) South-South cooperation (*continued*) (A/C.2/68/L.74 and A/C.2/68/L.5)

Draft resolution on South-South cooperation (A/C.2/68/L.74 and A/C.2/68/L.5)

81. **The Chair** invited the Committee to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.74, submitted by Mr. Dhanapala (Sri Lanka), Vice-Chair of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.5. He took it that the Committee agreed to waive the 24-hour provision under rule 120 of the rules of procedure. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

82. *It was so decided.*

83. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.74 was adopted.*

84. *Draft resolution A/C.2/68/L.5 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 122: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (A/C.2/68/L.76)

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly (A/C.2/68/L.76)

85. **The Chair** drew attention to the Committee's tentative programme of work for the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly as contained in document A/C.2/68/L.76. He would take it that the Committee wished to approve the draft programme of work.

86. *It was so decided.*

87. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly was adopted.*

Agenda item 135: Programme planning (*continued*)

88. **The Chair** informed the Committee that he had been advised by the Secretariat that there were no matters requiring the Committee's attention or action under that agenda item. He took it that the Committee decided that no action was required of it under that agenda item.

89. *It was so decided.*

Conclusion of the work of the Second Committee

90. **Mr. Hanif** (Director, Office for Economic and Social Council Coordination/United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs) said that the Committee had met at a time when the United Nations development agenda was going through historic transitions. The General Assembly had decided to pursue a universal post-2015 development agenda, which was expected to launch transformational changes in developing and developed countries alike, by its objectives of eradicating poverty, protecting the planet, achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), addressing the particular issues of landlocked developing countries, least developed countries and small island developing States, and promoting sustainable development.

91. The United Nations had continued working to defragment its efforts in development, human rights and conflict prevention by increasingly enabling coordination with all partners, including those not traditionally considered to be in the field of development. A number of draft resolutions had been adopted to make the work of the United Nations more efficient and effective and bring the entire organization behind a universal development agenda.

92. The world of development was at the cusp of major changes and the Second Committee would play a major role in those. The adoption of over 40 draft resolutions on wide-ranging issues in the current session had reinforced its crucial role.

93. **The Chair** said that the Committee's work had addressed standards and expectations regarding the upcoming MDG deadline, the post-2015 development agenda and the linkages with the institutional architecture for the follow-up to Rio+20. The spirit of consensus, the hallmark of the Committee's work, had remained strong.

94. In total, 41 draft resolutions and one draft decision had been adopted. The draft resolutions made important contributions to the collective efforts to promote the eradication of poverty and sustainable development. The six special events held in 2013 were extremely valuable as vehicles for bringing new ideas from the outside into the Committee, on topics such as evidence-based policy making, the future of employment and partnerships for the MDGs.

95. The refinement of the Committee's working methods was an ongoing process. Three elements must be examined very carefully: a lack of clarity regarding programme budget implication procedures and the role of the Second Committee vis-à-vis the Fifth Committee; the use of the no-objection procedure, which should perhaps be exercised with greater discretion; and finding ways to ensure that deadlines were maintained for greater efficiency.

96. *After an exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared that the Committee had completed its work for the sixty-eighth session.*

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.